UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/532,942	08/23/2006	David Pelz	100M185-US1	2651
7278 DARBY & DA	7590 08/01/200 RBY P.C.	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 770			LEGESSE, NINI F	
Church Street Station New York, NY 10008-0770			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ŕ			3711	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/01/2008	PAPER

# Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/532,942	PELZ, DAVID			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Nini Legesse	3711			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 Ju     This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)☑ This     Since this application is in condition for allowant closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4)  Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) 3-12 is/are withdrawn  5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6)  Claim(s) 1, 2, and 13 is/are rejected.  7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or  Application Papers  9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner  10)  The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the or	r from consideration. The election requirement. The epted or b) □ objected to by the E				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti					
,—	anniner. Note the attached Office	Action of form F 10-132.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119  12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) All b) Some color None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	nte			

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

Applicant's response to the office action of 03/27/08 and Applicant's Request for Continued Examination (RCE) is acknowledged on 07/11/08.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is not clear as to what is being claimed since claim 1 recites the use of markings and claim 13 appears to eliminate markings.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 2, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sellar (US Patent No. 5,662,530).

Sellar discloses a golf ball comprising two equatorial o-rings (9 as shown in Fig.

3). Elements 16 are considered as polar markings. As shown in figure 3, the bold outline

of the landing mark 16 at the center is considered as an o-ring that is parallel to the two equatorial –rings (9). Regarding the intended use recitation of claim 1 that the movement of the o-rings is to indicate if the ball has been squarely struck and so on, it should be noted that a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pettigrew et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0036870) in view of Koch (5,013,046).

Pettigrew discloses a golf ball comprising two equatorial o-rings (112 as shown on Figure 1A). However, Pettigrew fails to disclose polar markings as recited in claim 1. Koch discloses polar markings that are continuous o-rings (67a). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the Pettigrew device with multiple polar markings as taught by Koch in order to identify multiple hit points. When these two

Application/Control Number: 10/532,942 Page 4

Art Unit: 3711

references are combined the claimed intended use of the markings would obviously be met.

Claims 1, 2 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koch (5,013,046) in view of over Pettigrew et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0036870).

Koch discloses a golf ball comprising markings printed in each polar region as a continuous o-ring (67a). He also discloses multiple markings around the equator of the ball that meets Applicant's intended use recitation. However Koch fails to disclose if the markings around the equator of the ball could be two equatorial continuous o-rings. Pettigrew is one reference that teaches the use of two equatorial o-rings (112) that meets the intended use of Applicant's recitation in claim 1. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the Koch device with two equatorial o-rings to simplify the manufacturing process and time of the device.

### Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 2 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nini Legesse whose telephone number is (571) 272-4412. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 AM - 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gene Kim can be reached on (571) 272-4463. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Nini Legesse/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3711